

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-4304

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DONOVAN ISAIAH JONES,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (7:08-cr-00461-HMH-1)

Submitted: September 18, 2009

Decided: October 1, 2009

Before WILKINSON and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James B. Loggins, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. Alan Lance Crick, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donovan Isaiah Jones was indicted for sale of marijuana in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(D) (2006), and unlawful transport of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2006) and 18 U.S.C. § 924(e)(1) (West 2006 & Supp. 2008). Jones pled guilty without the benefit of a written plea agreement. The district court sentenced Jones to concurrent terms of sixty months' imprisonment and two years' supervised release for the drug offense and 212 months' imprisonment and five years' supervised release for the firearms conviction. On appeal, counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), noting no meritorious issues for appeal, but questioning whether the sentence imposed was reasonable. Finding no error, we affirm.

We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court complied with the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. We further find that the district court imposed a sentence that is procedurally and substantively reasonable. See Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 128 S. Ct. 586, 597 (2007) (review of sentence is for abuse of discretion).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing,

of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such filing would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED